PATTERNS OF POWER
A THEORETICAL ADDENDUM TO
THE MANUFACTURED GROUND

The Field of Anchors

How an anchor pacifies an inside only by constituting an outside — a theoretical addendum to The Manufactured Ground

This addendum assumes one thing of its reader: that they have read The Manufactured Ground and accept its argument. It assumes nothing else — not the working papers, not the later case studies. It takes the parent volume's finished theory and carries it one step past where that volume stopped, into the space the parent volume never entered: the space between hierarchies. Where the parent volume asked how an anchor settles the inside of one order, this asks what an anchor does to the world outside that

order — and finds that the two questions have the same answer, pointed in opposite directions.

THE FIELD OF ANCHORS
SECTION ONE

1. Where the parent volume stops

The Manufactured Ground established a single, powerful claim and demonstrated it across four civilisations. The claim is that a distribution of holdings taken by force becomes a settled order only when the armed men who hold it acquire a shared source of legitimate title — an *anchor* — placed outside their own competition, in a god, an eternal law, an impersonal mandate of the cosmos, where no one of them can seize it or become it. The anchor works, the parent volume showed, because it makes the armed men's interests point the same way: if every holding draws its rightfulness from one source, then an attack on any single title is an attack on the ground beneath them all, and the others unite against the aggressor rather than joining him. This is how Rome after Constantine, Sasanian Persia, the early caliphate, and imperial China each converted a camp of armed men into an order that lasted centuries. The convergence of four unrelated creeds on one structure was the argument's evidence.

Notice what the parent volume took as its unit. In every case it studied *one* hierarchy, from the inside, and asked how that hierarchy held together. The anchor's whole job, as the volume described it, is inward: it pacifies the armed men *within* a single settlement. And the volume was right to work that way, because the inside is where the mechanism is visible and where the four civilisations offer their clean comparison.

But an inside implies an outside, and the parent volume never turned to look at it. This is not a flaw in the volume; it is simply the edge of its subject. The volume asked how the war *inside* a hierarchy ends. It did not ask what happens to that war — whether it truly ends, or merely goes somewhere else. This addendum argues that it goes somewhere else, that it must, and that the reason is contained in the parent volume's own mechanism, waiting to be read out of it. The anchor does not abolish the war among armed men. It relocates the war to the edge of the settlement it creates. And the same apparatus that earns a society its internal peace is the apparatus that guarantees the fight beyond its border.

THE FIELD OF ANCHORS
SECTION TWO

2. Every anchor makes an outside

The parent volume's mechanism, read carefully, contains a fact the volume did not dwell on. Reconsider how the anchor unites the armed men. It works, the volume says, because every man's holding draws its rightfulness from *the same source*, so that an attack on one is an attack on the ground of all. Read that requirement for what it silently demands. It demands that the aggressor, the victim, and the watching bystanders all hold their titles from one common ground. The whole force of the mechanism comes from a source that every relevant party stands on together.

Now ask the question the parent volume did not: who does *not* stand on that ground? And the answer is built into the anchor by construction. An anchor that authored the title of every human being equally would draw no line at all — it would not distinguish those inside the settlement from those outside it, and a settlement with no outside is not a settlement but the entire world, which no anchor has ever been. To bind an inside is to define an outside. The two are one act. The Roman order that made a shared Romanitas the ground of every citizen's standing, by the very same stroke, made the barbarian beyond the limes into a being whose holdings that ground did not author and whose life it did not protect. The sealed law that bound the community of Islam sorted the rest of humanity into the categories of an order built for insiders. The Mandate of Heaven that authorised the Son of Heaven left the peoples beyond the civilised world with no place in the cosmology except as tribute-bearers or threats. Sasanian kingship, wedded to the sacred fire, drew its line at the edge of the Aryan lands and the true faith.

This is not incidental to those four anchors. It is a property of anchors as such. **Each anchor manufactures its own outside as the by-product of manufacturing its inside, and the men on the far side of that line are, to the settlement, precisely what the pre-settlement neighbour was to the individual armed man in the parent volume's opening pages: a holder of possessions the common ground does not reach, defensible by force alone.**

From this the addendum's thesis follows directly, and it is bleaker than anything in the parent volume, because the parent volume only ever looked inward. The apparatus that ends the war of all against all *inside* a hierarchy is the same apparatus that guarantees a war of all against all *between* hierarchies. Rising above the warlord does not abolish the warlord. It enlarges him. The unit of predation scales up — from the baron to the kingdom to the empire — and the belief that stopped the barons killing one another is exactly the belief that tells the empire its wars beyond the frontier are righteous. The parent volume's four orders did not experience this as a contradiction, and could not, because each order's anchor told it, in perfect sincerity, that the people beyond the line were barbarians, infidels, the uncivilised — that the war at the frontier was not warlordism at all but the defence of civilisation, the spread of the faith, the tribute owed to Heaven. The same anchor did both jobs. It ended the internal war by naming a righteousness, and it licensed the external war with the identical name.

THE FIELD OF ANCHORS
SECTION THREE

3. The rival creed is an anchor, not a solvent

There is a natural mistake to make here, and correcting it is the sharpest work this addendum does, because the mistake looks exactly like a discovery.

Watch an anchored order fall to a rival creed — a sacred monarchy overthrown by a revolutionary movement carrying a wholly different account of who should rule and why. It is tempting to conclude that one has found a new way for an anchor to fail: that a rival *belief* can dissolve an anchor by out-believing it, defeating the old legitimacy in a contest of stories. This would be a genuine addition to the parent volume, which described how anchors are built and how they lose their grip but not how one might be defeated by another.

The conclusion is wrong, and seeing why is the whole point. The rival creed does not arrive as a disembodied argument that out-reasons the old anchor. It arrives *carried by a rival hierarchy* — a coalition of armed men with a floor of force of its own and an anchor of its own — and it does to the old order exactly what the parent volume showed one hierarchy does to another when it conquers it. The belief did not defeat the belief. One hierarchy out-*floored* another, and brought its own legitimating story with it, ready-made, for the settlement it intended to impose.

Consider the clearest modern instance, and test it by the parent volume's own requirements. A later study in this series examined the Ethiopian empire, whose armed elite was bound for seven centuries by an anchor of the purest kind — descent from Solomon of Israel, a source of title no Ethiopian competitor could forge, because no man can make himself another man's ancestor. That order fell, in 1974, to a Marxist military movement, and a decade earlier had been invaded by Fascist Italy. It is tempting to say Marxism, or Italian nationalism, *dissolved* the Solomonic anchor — defeated an old sacred story with a newer, more persuasive one.

But run Marxism-Leninism, as that movement held it, through the parent volume's test for a working anchor, and it passes on every count. Is its source of

authority placed outside the competition of the men it binds? Entirely: it grounds rule in the laws of historical development, an impersonal process standing above any individual claimant exactly as the Mandate of Heaven stands above any individual emperor. Is it uncontestable — proof against a rival's revision? Remarkably so: one cannot out-argue the science of history, only be convicted of *deviation* from it, which is the unmistakable mark of an authority that has been placed beyond the reach of the men it governs. Is it cosmically framed, in the parent volume's sense — does it make a made arrangement of power feel like the structure of reality unfolding? Its whole eschatology is nothing else: a guaranteed arc of history toward a determined end, in which the vanguard party's rule is not one option among many but the very motion of the cosmos made governmental. Does it perform belief's twofold work — cheap compliance below, and the binding of the armed above? It is built for both. And does it solve succession, the second point at which the parent volume showed exogenous legitimacy is indispensable? It does, through the party's own procedures rather than a bloodline or a strongman's sword.

Marxism-Leninism, in short, is one of the most complete exogenous anchors the modern world produced. That is *why* it worked — why it could bind a vanguard, pacify a population, and legitimate a whole new distribution of holdings. It was not a solvent poured on Ethiopia's anchor. It was a rival anchor, arriving on the point of a rival hierarchy's spears, and it displaced the Solomonic order the way the parent volume's conquerors displaced the orders they overran. Italian nationalism, the year it invaded, was the same thing in a European key: the legal fictions of the modern sovereign nation wrapped in the myth of Rome reborn — a complete anchor, for Italians, that authored nothing and meant nothing to an Ethiopian, and so arrived at the Ethiopian frontier as pure floor, force in a robe cut for an audience across the sea.

The correction generalises. What looks like belief defeating belief is almost always one anchored hierarchy conquering another and installing its own anchor in the ruins. There is always more than one settlement in the world. Each has done the parent volume's internal work; each faces the others across a line no shared anchor spans; and the fall of one order to another's creed is not a new species of failure but the oldest thing in the parent volume — conquest — seen from the losing side, with attention wrongly fixed on the incoming belief rather than the coalition carrying it.

THE FIELD OF ANCHORS
SECTION FOUR

4. Between the hierarchies there is no anchor

If every anchor faces inward and constitutes an outside, then the space *between* hierarchies has a definite character, and it is worth naming precisely, because it is the exact opposite of what the parent volume described.

The parent volume showed how the war among armed men ends *inside* a settlement. Between settlements, that war has never ended, and the reason is now visible: the thing that would end it — a common anchor authoring every hierarchy's title from a source none of them controls — has never durably existed at that scale. Each hierarchy's anchor is inside-facing by construction, so there is no shared ground on which empires stand together the way barons come to stand together within one realm. Between the hierarchies, the parent volume's founding condition simply persists, unsolved. Each order is, in the world at large, a mere *possessor* of its place — holding by force what it can defend now — and not an *owner*, because there is no exogenous author of the distribution of holdings among the powers.

This condition has a name in the study of relations between states, and the parent volume's readers should borrow it. The theorist Kenneth Waltz called the defining feature of the world of states *anarchy* — not chaos, but the strict structural fact that there is no authority *above* the states, no ruler of rulers, no anchor over the anchored. His picture is the parent volume's opening scene, frozen and never resolved: a field of armed powers, each thrown back on its own force for survival because no shared authority will reliably come to its defence. That is the parent volume's warlord world, its bystander problem unsolved, raised to the scale of hierarchies.

It is not quite true that *nothing* operates between the hierarchies, and the qualification matters. The historian Hedley Bull argued, against the picture of pure anarchy, that states in long contact form not merely a system of collisions but a thin *society* — a set of powers that come to regard themselves as bound by common rules and to share a few weak common institutions: the balance of power, diplomacy, the

mutual recognition of one another's sovereignty, a law of nations. And Bull noted, in a phrase that lands squarely in the parent volume's vocabulary, that among the goals such a society pursues is the *stabilisation of possession* — the very conversion of holding into right that the parent volume made its subject, appearing here at the level of states.

Read through the parent volume, Bull's international society is a *proto-anchor*: a weak, partial, chronically contested attempt to manufacture, between hierarchies, the shared ground that an anchor supplies robustly within one. And it has exactly the weakness the parent volume's theory would predict of an anchor with no floor beneath it. Within a hierarchy, the anchor's verdicts are enforced — the coalition of the bound *is* the floor that falls on a violator. Between hierarchies, there is no coalition that reliably forms, because there is no shared ground to trigger it, because each anchor faces inward; and so the proto-anchor issues verdicts that the strongest powers honour when it suits them and ignore when it does not. It is revisable by the strong, thinly known, and unenforced — which is to say it has every weakness the parent volume named, and holds only to the precise edge of what the mightiest floors consent to be bound by.

The Ethiopian case supplies the illustration again. When Fascist Italy invaded in 1935, the League of Nations — the era's most ambitious proto-anchor, an actual institution of the powers — condemned the aggression and imposed sanctions, and it changed nothing, because no floor stood behind the verdict willing to enforce it against a determined great power. The proto-anchor ruled, and its ruling fell dead, exactly as the parent volume's theory says a legitimacy with no force beneath it must. Contestability between hierarchies runs only to the edge of what the strongest consent to honour, and between hierarchies with no authority above them, that edge is usually close.

THE FIELD OF ANCHORS
SECTION FIVE

5. What this refines in The Manufactured Ground

Two refinements follow, and it is proper to state them plainly, since a refinement shelved beside the volume it refines owes the reader a clear account of what it changes and what it leaves standing.

The first is small and concerns a word. The parent volume required that the anchor be *exogenous* — placed outside the human contest altogether, in heaven or an eternal law. The between-hierarchy analysis, together with the later case studies, shows this to be slightly too strong. What the anchor must actually be is *unforgeable by the men presently competing for it*. Exogeneity — placing the source outside the world entirely — is the surest way to achieve that, and the commonest, which is why the parent volume's four theistic and cosmological cases all took that form. But it is a means, not the requirement itself. The Ethiopian anchor named above was a bloodline — a thing entirely inside the human world, a lineage of living men — and it was nonetheless unforgeable, because no rival could make himself a descendant of Solomon. An anchor need not stand outside the world. It need only stand beyond the reach of the particular men contesting it. This does not weaken the parent volume's argument; it widens the class of anchors the argument covers, and it should be read as a clarification of the volume's deep claim rather than a retreat from it.

The second refinement is this addendum's own, and it is the larger one. The parent volume gave a complete theory of the inside of a hierarchy and left the outside dark. This addendum lights the outside and finds there a permanent condition the parent volume's method cannot reach: a field of anchored hierarchies, each having done the internal work, none sharing a ground with the others, contending across lines that no anchor spans, in a space where the only legitimacy available is a proto-anchor too weak to bind the strong. The parent volume is a theory of how the war ends. This addendum is the observation that the war does not end but changes address — that every anchor, in ending the war within, draws the border along

which the war without will be fought, and hands the fighters on its own side a robe of righteousness to wear while they fight it.

The parent volume should therefore be read with one sentence added at its edge, which this addendum exists to supply: *the anchor that pacifies an inside constitutes an outside, and across that outside the war the anchor ended within is not abolished but relocated and rescaled.* Everything the parent volume proved remains proved. It is only that the thing it proved has a second face, and the second face is turned toward the rest of the world.

THE FIELD OF ANCHORS
SECTION SIX

6. The wound, relocated

The parent volume closed its preface on a note of conscience — that the sacred which bound the armed men and pacified the ruled also sanctified real subjection and licensed real cruelty, and that to make an order's machinery legible is not to pardon it. This addendum adds the outward face of that same conscience, and it is, in the end, the same wound.

The anchor that ends the war inside a hierarchy does so by constituting an outside, and across that outside the war does not end but changes scale. The barons stop raiding one another and the kingdom raids its neighbours; the kingdoms compose into an empire and the empire clears a frontier; and every step upward in coordination is a step upward in the reach of the violence that the settlement's own righteousness now licenses beyond its edge. The internally pacified order does not feel this as a contradiction, because the anchor that pacified it also told it, in perfect sincerity, that the people past the line are barbarians, infidels, the unfree — that the war beyond the frontier is not warlordism but civilisation, the faith, the will of Heaven. One story does both jobs. It ends the war within by naming a righteousness, and it licenses the war without with the identical name. And because the parent volume proved that the harm an order can do scales with the coordination it achieves, the very orders that rose highest above the warlord — Rome, the caliphate, China, and every heir of theirs — were the orders that could carry conquest, subjection, and clearance to the largest scale the world had seen, and describe the whole of it as order.

None of this is an argument against settling a hierarchy. The internal peace is real and worth having; the person inside a settled order is, on every measure that touches an ordinary life, freer and safer than the person in the warlord's camp, and the parent volume's insistence on that holds here without a word withdrawn. It is only the observation that the peace has an outside, that the outside is where the parent volume's own logic predicts the violence will pool, and that a theory which looks only inward has seen the better half of the machine and left the worse half in the

dark. This addendum exists to light the worse half — not to unbuild the anchor, which is the best thing armed men have ever made, but to show the border it draws, and the war that waits along it, and the robe of righteousness the anchor hands to everyone who fights on its side of the line.

THE FIELD OF ANCHORS
SCOPE & SOURCES

A note on sources and scope

This is a theoretical addendum to *The Manufactured Ground* and assumes that volume's argument; it does not re-argue the anchor, the possession/ownership distinction, the twofold work of belief, or the four cases (Rome, Sasanian Persia, early Islam, imperial China), all of which are the parent volume's. It takes those as given and extends them to the space between hierarchies, which the parent volume did not treat.

The between-hierarchy material draws on the tradition that studies relations among states. Kenneth Waltz's *Theory of International Politics* (1979) supplies the concept of *anarchy* as the ordering principle of the world of states — the structural absence of any authority above them, and the self-help condition that follows — which this addendum reads as the parent volume's warlord world persisting, unsolved, at the scale of hierarchies. Hedley Bull's *The Anarchical Society* (1977) supplies the counter-position that states form a thin *society* bound by weak common institutions — the balance of power, diplomacy, international law, mutual recognition of sovereignty — among whose ends Bull lists the "stabilisation of possession"; this addendum reads that society as a chronically weak proto-anchor, and explains its weakness by the parent volume's own theory, as a legitimacy with no floor beneath it to enforce its verdicts against the strong.

The illustrative cases beyond the parent volume's four — the Ethiopian Solomonic order and its fall in 1974, the Italian invasion of 1935 and the League's unenforced condemnation, and the characterisation of Marxism-Leninism and of Fascist *romanità* as functioning anchors — are treated at length elsewhere in the series and are used here only as far as the argument requires. The claim that those modern creeds satisfy the parent volume's requirements for an anchor, and therefore acted as rival anchors rather than as solvents, is this addendum's analytical contention, offered in the parent volume's own terms and testable against them. The refinement of "exogenous" to "unforgeable by the present competitors" is likewise

developed across the later case studies and is stated here as a clarification of the parent volume's deep claim rather than a departure from it.

Part of the collection Patterns of Power. *Held as tested, not revealed.*